



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,047	07/10/2006	Wilhelmus Josephus Bronnenberg	NL040009	5252
24737	7590	08/02/2010	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			JOHN, CLARENCE	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2443	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/02/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/597,047	Applicant(s) BRONNENBERG ET AL.
	Examiner CLARENCE JOHN	Art Unit 2443

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2010.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 13-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 13-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection.

Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's RCE filed on 7/9/2010 has been entered.

Status of Claims

This action is responsive to RCE filed on July 9, 2010 and amended Claims filed on June 23, 2010 where the Applicant amended Claims 13 - 25. Claims 13-27 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/23/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and do not place the Application in condition for allowance.
2. The Applicant's argument regarding Theriault's teachings are **moot** in view of the new ground of rejection by **Pham et al. (US 2003/0074473)**.

3. The Applicant also argues that Hughes, Abdulrahiman, Safadi or Gorman does not teach devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device.
4. **In reply**, the Examiner states that Hughes, Abdulrahiman, Safadi or Gorman was never relied upon such a limitation. Theriault was previously relied upon such a limitation, but this argument is **moot** in view of the new ground of rejection by Pham et al.
5. The Applicant also argues that in a UPnP network, Cheng does not teach storing content information by an UPnP content directory service.
6. **In reply**, the Examiner states that the above argument is **moot** in view of the new ground of rejection by **Phan et al. (US 2004/0193609)**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-12. are Cancelled.

8. Claims 13, 15, 17, 19, and 22 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham et al. (US 2003/0074473) in view of Hughes et al. (US 6,065,055).

9. With respect to Claim 13, Pham teaches a method of filtering and storing information about content stored on at least one network device and accessible via a network, said content being potentially useable by a plurality of network rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the method comprising the steps of :

- a) filtering information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92);
- b) storing in a content directory the filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by said at least one network rendering device; (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6]); and;
- c) searching or browsing the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be

rendered by the at least one network rendering device; (Page 7, paragraph [0064], Page 8, paragraph [0068] lines 14-19);

10. wherein said searching or browsing of the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device is performed independently (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which is performed independently)

11. Pham teaches the limitations of Claim 13 as described above. However, Pham does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

12. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

13. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

14. With respect to Claim 15, Pham and Hughes teach the method as claimed in Claim 13, wherein content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92) comprises content having a transport protocol that is not compatible with the at least one network rendering device. (Pham - Page 5 paragraph [0050] lines 1-12, lines 19-12. Here, IPsec protocol is the transport protocol used to transfer packets to crypto processor 86 which is not compatible with one network device)

15. With respect to Claim 17, Pham and Hughes teach the limitation as described in Claim 13 above.

16. However, Pham does not explicitly state about said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices is repeated over a "predefined time interval".

17. Conversely, Hughes does in fact teach such a limitation. (Hughes' teachings on Figure 10, Scan Interval of 5 minutes, Column 5, lines 10-12).

18. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

19. With respect to Claim 19, Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed in claim 13 wherein said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices is performed where a new network rendering device is added to the network. (Pham's teachings on Figure 1, Page 3 – paragraph [0039] lines 8-12. Here, the establishment of new network connection includes the remote gateway 20).

20. With respect to Claim 22, Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed in claim 13, further comprising selecting content for transfer via the network to the at least one network rendering device, (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 19-22); wherein said selecting is based on the searching or browsing step, (Pham - Page 8, paragraph [0068] lines 14-19); and wherein said content selected for transfer is renderable by the at least one network rendering device. (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0052] lines 1-4).

21. With respect to Claim 23, Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed in claim 13 wherein said method further comprises the step of : filtering information about the content to yield filtered information including content (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices, (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92); and making available on the network said filtered information including content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device. (Pham Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6]. The stored information is available on the network).

22. Pham and Hughes teach the limitation of Claim 23 as described above. However, Pham does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

23. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

24. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

25. With respect to Claim 24, Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed in claim 23, wherein said method further comprises the step of : initiating an action based on said filtered information including information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device, wherein the action comprises **any** of the following: upgrading the network; b) downloading and/or installing a codec; c) adapting a security parameter; (Pham - Page 1 – paragraph [0008] lines 1-10, Page – paragraph [0039] lines 18-22) d) recommending the purchase or upgrade of at least one network rendering device; and e) providing a human-perceptible explanation of why content is unusable by the at least one network rendering device.

26. With respect to Claim 25, Pham teaches a device adapted for filtering and storing information about content accessible via a network, said content being potentially useable by a plurality of network rendering device adapted for rendering content, the device comprising: a) at least one filtering element adapted to filter information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of content (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of

the plurality of network rendering devices; (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92); and b) a storage element containing a content directory including the filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by said at least one network rendering device (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6));

27. wherein the content directory is searchable or browseable to enable review of said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device, (Page 7, paragraph [0064], Page 8, paragraph [0068] lines 14-19); and searching or browsing of the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device is performed independently of said periodic filtering by the at least one filtering element. (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which is performed independently); to yield filtered information devoid of information about content (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device. (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92).

28. Pham teaches the limitations of Claim 25 as described above. However,

Pham does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

29. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval.

(Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10,

lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval

of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy

monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked

material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

30. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and

devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of

Hughes with Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering

and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

31. With respect to Claim 26, Pham and Hughes teach a media server

embodying the device of claim 25. (Pham - Figure 1, Page 1 – paragraph

[0009] lines 3-8).

32. With respect to Claim 27, Pham and Hughes teach a network comprising

the device of claim 25 (Pham - Figure 1); and at least one network

rendering device (Pham -Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the

data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84).

33. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham and Hughes in further view of Abdulrahiman et al. (US 2003/0023671)

34. With respect to Claim 14, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13.

35. However Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings about the content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices.

36. Conversely Abdulrahiman does in fact teach such a limitation.

Abdulrahiman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices. Abdulrahiman also teaches about the content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21, Paragraph [0039], lines 3-5).

37. Pham, Hughes and Abdulrahiman teach about filtering contents among the servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Abdulrahiman with Pham and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain supported data formats.

38. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham and Hughes in further view of Safadi (US 2003/0126086).

Art Unit: 2443

39. With respect to Claim 16, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13.
40. However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a method according to claim 1, wherein a content having a DRM system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices.
41. Conversely Safadi does in fact teach such a limitation. Safadi teaches about copy protection of contents and Digital Rights Management (DRM) over communication network and devices. (Page 2, paragraph [0021, lines 1-2].)
42. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Safadi teaches about copy protection of content information. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Safadi with Pham and Hughes in order to interface with multiple content providers and provide copy protection of content.
43. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham and Hughes in further view of Gorman (US 2002/0143780).
44. With respect to Claim 18, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state

about teaching a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network.

45. Conversely Gorman teaches the above limitation. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

46. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Pham and Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

47. With respect to Claim 20, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. Also, Pham and Hughes teach a method of filtering (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); and storing information about content is performed (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6); for a predefined time interval (Hughes teachings on Figure 10, Scan Interval, Column 5, lines 10-12).

48. However Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state about filtering which is performed when a network device has been removed.

49. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data.

Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

50. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Pham and Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

51. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham and Hughes in further view of Phan et al. (US 2004/0193609).

52. With respect to Claim 21, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings wherein the network is a UPnP network and the information about the content is stored by an UPnP content directory service.

53. Conversely Phan does in fact teach such a limitation. Phan teaches a master content directory service representing all of the content within the network. (Abstract lines 1-3). Phan also teaches a UPnP architecture

defining general interaction between UPnP control points and UPnP network devices (Page 2 – paragraph [0020], Page 3 - paragraph [0024]); and the information about content is stored by an UPnP content directory service Page 2 – paragraph [0020] lines 12-16, Page 5 – paragraph [0040] lines 7-12).

54. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices over a network. Phan also teaches storing information content in a communication network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Phan with Pham and Hughes employing a UPnP network which is self configuring and has the network controller which is capable of discovering and controlling other devices.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLARENCE JOHN whose telephone number is (571)270-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2443

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CJ/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2443
7/28/2010

/Tonia LM Dollinger/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443